

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/75

Paper 5 (Special Subject – The Civil Rights Movement in the USA, 1954–1980), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

1 (a) How far do the events described in Document C corroborate the criticisms of the legal authorities made in Document D? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use not only of the text, but of headings and attributions.

Both sources criticise the police. Document C is most explicit about the police who are accused of encouraging violence in so far as 'the rioting ... was instigated' by them and they were prepared to stand by whilst the KKK attacked the Freedom Riders. The KKK was given 15 minutes to attack the protestors. To some extent this is corroborated in Document D as the police did not act against the registrar for attacking John Hardy. Further, the arrest of him (Hardy) suggests the police were not prepared to tolerate those who challenged White supremacy, which further corroborates Document C. When the legal authorities were approached for help Black Americans were ignored. Document C records 'a coloured woman pleading for help' from Officer Turner but being dismissed and Document D explains that people 'were refused the right to register'.

Document D concentrates more on the bias of the courts. The trial of Billy Jack Caston was clearly prejudiced by a 'courthouse packed with farmers ... bearing guns' and an atmosphere in which witnesses were intimidated to an extent that 'we gave our testimony and then left the court for our own safety'. The verdict acquitting Caston might be explained as the result of the pressure created by those in the courthouse or, simply, the racism of the jury and judge, which candidates will know from the history of such cases in Mississippi, were white and almost certainly racists.

Indeed, the fact that these accounts are typical of the region in 1961 might encourage candidates to argue that both documents are reliable. The author of Document C was an FBI agent actually there at the time of the violence in Birmingham who as a mole in the KKK would, presumably, have gained a real insight into the attitudes and actions of the KKK. Knowledge of the activities of the KKK in the years before 1961 and after could be applied to confirm the reliability of the author despite any reservations one might have about writing the account 15 years after the event. It could be argued that Document D is reliable for similar reasons in that the author was a witness to the events he describes and the campaign to register voters was resisted strongly by White supremacists. On the other hand, he was the victim of being 'severely beaten by Billy Jack Caston' and it is not surprising that he is critical of the legal authorities. Nonetheless, his account is matter of fact, merely stating what he remembers without the use of emotive language or prejudice. This might be explained by the fact that he, too, is writing after the event. The reliability of both documents is reinforced by the context of 1961 when non-violence as a form of protest by the Civil Rights movement was very strong. In neither Document C nor D is there any indication of violence by Black Americans. Conversely, the violence of the police and the prejudice of the courts in Mississippi against civil rights activists were virtually unchecked at this time.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that interference in the affairs of the States was the main reason for White opposition to civil rights for black Americans? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently, with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

States rights were a sensitive issue. Candidates could place this in its historical context and explain how this had been the case since the foundation of the USA. Indeed, Document A claims that this principle was an integral part of the fabric of Southern society. Document A explicitly identifies the defence of States rights as the main reason for White opposition to civil rights for Black Americans. This is stressed in the opening lines of the document which complain about the Supreme Court and the judiciary in imposing decisions, notably on education, on the States and infringing their rights in the process. This is described as 'an abuse of judicial power' and 'an unwarranted exercise of power by the Court' and that 'Parents should not be deprived by government' of their rights. This is seen as a threat to the 'amicable relations between the White and Negro races' since the end of the civil war ('through 90 years of patient effort'): the validity of such a claim many candidates might challenge with knowledge of the past. Nonetheless, the sincerity of the views expressed can hardly be doubted, representing the majority of the Southern politicians in Congress who, themselves, reflect the views of their constituencies. Specific reference to the *Brown v Board of Education of Topeka* in 1954 can be expected. This rejected the doctrine of 'separate but equal' which was held in the South, with regard to schooling, and overturned previous judgements such as the *Plessy Case* of 1896 and the *Taft judgement* of 1927 which probably explains the reference in Document A to 'these rights, restated time and again'.

Hostility to outside interference in the affairs of states is hinted at in Documents B, C and D. In the former Ernest asserts that the troops were in Little Rock 'because our state government went against federal law' implying resistance by the State to the de-segregation of schools on the grounds that each State had the right to decide for itself. In this respect it reinforces the views expressed in Document A that education was the responsibility of parents. Sammy seems to accept these views in his belief that 'our Governor was trying to protect us'. Officer Collins in Document C is emphatic in his resistance to 'anybody telling us what to do in our State'. Similar sentiments are expressed in Source D with the comment in the final sentence that rejects outside (northern) interference in the South on the grounds that the North had no moral right to do so.

Other factors should be considered, the most obvious of which was overt racism which is evident in all the documents. However, better candidates might discern different shades of racism. For example, opposition to intermarriage is stressed in Documents B and D. Blind racial prejudice is emphasised, based it seems, according to Document B, on inherited attitudes and ignorance, which is confirmed in Document E which argues that 'race prejudice has shaped our history'. No doubt these points may explain the racism evident in Documents C, D and E though it seems that resistance to civil rights for Black Americans can be explained more by the perceived threat to the supremacy and privileges of the whites. This might be argued in the field of education (Document B). Knowledge about the Little Rock Nine and the experiences of Elizabeth Eckford, for example, would be useful to explain white

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

resistance to integrated schools. Whites also regarded the exercise of the vote by Black Americans as a threat to their political supremacy. This is demonstrated in Document D. The work of the NAACP and the fate of civil rights activists in many States, especially Mississippi, would be helpful to illustrate the opposition of whites to political reform. Some may refer to the case of the three civil rights activists killed in Philadelphia, Mississippi, in 1964, which was the basis of the film 'Mississippi Burning'. White anger at the desegregation of buses was intense and at the heart of the events described in Document C: the campaign of civil rights Freedom Riders to see that this was enforced might be explained. Similarly, the concerns of poor whites about the consequences of civil rights for Black Americans on their job prospects and standards of living is revealed in Document E. Reference to the riots of 1967 could be made to illustrate the extent of white resistance and that it was not confined to the South. The riots in Detroit in July were the worst of the decade, in which 43 died. Such violence was an indication of the depth of white hostility to civil rights for Black Americans made worse by the tendency of some of the black communities to use violence themselves.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

2 'Of all his qualities, his skill as an organiser was most important.' How far do you agree with this view of Martin Luther King as a civil rights leader in the period 1955 to 1968? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. There were various facets to the leadership of Martin Luther King, one of which was his ability to organise others. This can be demonstrated by reference to many protests which King played a major role in organising, for example, the Montgomery boycott (of buses) of 1956, the sit-ins in Birmingham in 1963 against the segregation of the city's public facilities and the Selma March of 1965 in support of the rights of Black Americans to register as voters. In all cases the action achieved success but others were disappointing, for example, the Chicago campaign of 1966 against housing discrimination. Neither was King always the instigator or organiser of key protests. The Freedom Rides of 1961 were organised by CORE and the March on Washington of 1963 was the work of Randolph and Rustin, although King played a prominent role. As leader of the SCLC from 1957 King managed to use the organisation as an umbrella organisation to co-ordinate other groups in the South, notably the NAACP. However, his influence over other more radical groups like the Black Panthers was clearly limited from the mid-1960s. King's other qualities as a communicator clearly deserves emphasis. His powers of oratory were an inspiration, notably his speech at Lincoln's Memorial in 1963 and his writings, such as 'Letter from Birmingham Jail', were equally important in articulating and explaining the issues at the heart of the civil rights movement. He knew how to maximise the power of the media. Some will stress the importance of his strategy of non-violence, not least because a more aggressive stance would have provoked a backlash and undermined the credibility of the movement given that legally Black Americans had the rights they wanted but they were simply denied them in practice. The strategy helped persuade whites to support the cause and effectively gave the movement moral force. His cultivation of prominent politicians, especially Presidents, was crucial. Both Kennedy and Johnson were willing to talk with and support King, intervening at important times to resolve crises in the South and to introduce legislation, though it could be argued that King's activities merely presented the politicians with the opportunity to address various issues they otherwise might not have been able to do. Some candidates may stress the charisma of King, which to a degree was based on the combination of the factors mentioned above. However, his obvious integrity, loyalty and commitment to his friends and family were also an important aspect of his appeal.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should do more than assess the intrinsic importance of several factors. There is scope to prioritise the importance of each factor identified. The links between factors could also be assessed. The limits of King's influence and leadership could be assessed as indicated above. In addition, he had little impact in the North and as implied above, his effectiveness as an organiser and leader was, arguably, beginning to wane by the time of his death.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

AO4 – write in a structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

3 Assess the importance of the role of the media in advancing the cause of civil rights for Black Americans in the period 1954 to 1980. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – with explanation to the fore. An examination of the role of the media should embrace newspapers, radio and especially television. Candidates should consider the positive contribution of the media to the cause of civil rights. As a means of presenting the case of civil rights campaigners to a wide audience the publicity value of the media in the broadest sense could be assessed. News programmes, reports and studio debates on key issues like the desegregation of schools provided civil rights campaigners with the chance to present their case. Orators like King were able to articulate their views which impressed millions. King's 'I have a Dream' speech of 1963 was addressed to 250,000 in Washington but millions saw it on TV, heard it on the radio or read about it in the papers. Coverage of specific events which brought into sharp focus the struggle for civil rights could be examined. Images of police brutality and the violence of whites against Black Americans were instrumental in highlighting the issues and prompted politicians to address them. It is clear that Black American activists deliberately sought to organise protests (the more peaceful the better), knowing they would draw the anger of white resistance which would look ugly on television and portray the Black American as the victim. CORE organised the Freedom Rides specifically with this outcome in mind and it brought about the enforced desegregation of interstate transportation. The actions of the SNCC in sitting at lunch counters attracted the same media attention and led to the desegregation of lunch counters. Perhaps the brutality of 'Bull' O'Connor in Birmingham in 1963 is the best example of organising a march (with school children in this case) which enticed the police to react with dogs and water cannon. The adverse image of white racism was informative not just for American citizens but the wider world audience and the embarrassment caused to the US. It was a formative moment in the education of the Kennedy brothers. It was imperative for politicians to respond to such events given such prominence in the media. However, by the same token politicians had to court the votes of white racists and the media's coverage of events served to highlight the fears of the whites, however exaggerated, as much as the grievances, however just, of the Black Americans. This helps explain the caution of the Kennedys in intervening at times of crisis and the limitations of the legislation they introduced. Similarly, the spotlight shone on the whites by the media and the defensive position they found themselves in may be considered contributory factors in stimulating them to react violently. Arguably, the assassination of King in 1968 was a consequence of his high profile in the media, although the murder of Black Americans by whites had long been the response of the latter. Also, the press coverage of civil rights issues and events was not always favourable. Indeed, newspapers divided along partisan lines in this respect and as such the media, in some places at least, did not advance the cause of civil rights. Candidate may comment on how the ownership of the media could influence its reporting of the civil rights movement.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should be aiming to provide an argument showing

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

how the media did advance the cause of civil rights but how its effects in that respect were limited and indeed, may have been a negative influence. There may be a tendency to stress the impact of television rather than other channels but if the analysis is sustained this should not adversely affect the assessment of the answer. Similarly, there may be a tendency to focus on major moments in the period.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

- 4 'The strategy of Affirmative Action failed to deliver what it promised for the Black American civil rights movement in the 1970s.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative or description of events will not be credited as much as analysis and evaluation supported by a range of examples from the period. Affirmative action was introduced by Kennedy (1961–63) as a principle to ensure the civil rights of ethnic minorities and Black Americans. Reference to Kennedy's tentative steps, with his Plans for Progress, in this direction would be appropriate. Although segregation had been ended in law by 1970 unofficially it continued to be practised. In the 1970s affirmative action did make a difference. Nixon introduced 'creative federalism' which directed federal money directly to the states. He extended affirmative action to federal-funded projects aiming to achieve a level of 26% of the jobs in such projects for ethnic minorities within four years (1969–73). By 1974 affirmative action was applied to over 300,000 firms. Nixon also appointed James Farmer, the founder of CORE as assistant secretary in the Department of HEW. Affirmative action was upheld in law. In *Giggs versus Duke Power Company* in 1971 the Supreme Court upheld the right of the President to insist on affirmative action. In the 1980 case of *'Fullilove versus Klutznick'* the Court upheld the need to allocate 10% of jobs to ethnic minorities. Some high profile appointments by Carter (1977–81) as ambassadors, including Andrew Young as US ambassador to the UN, were made and served to re-enforce the principle of affirmative action. This principle had helped tens of thousands of Black Americans find jobs and places at university and increasing numbers were being elected to public office including Congress. However, Carter (1977–81) failed to promote or defend affirmative action. Indeed, the *Bakke* case of 1978 saw the Supreme Court reverse the principle in upholding a white student's right to enter the University of California. The economic and social plight of Black Americans was still poor in 1980. All indices of wages, housing, educational achievement, employment opportunities etc. demonstrate the inferior position of the Black Americans in relation to whites. Furthermore, the result of some Black Americans advancing their lot increased the divisions within Black American society. The practical difficulties of enforcement could be discussed and the entrenched ideas of the time.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	75

engage with controversy. A clear understanding of affirmative action is required and knowledge of what measures were adopted in the 1970s is needed. However, to assess whether the principle failed to deliver what it promises some consideration of the expectations of contemporaries might be attempted. Arguably, the commitment, even sincerity, of Nixon and Carter might be questioned. Were their motives more to do with weakening the powers of trade unions than advancing the lot of Black Americans? Certainly, by 1980 with declining economic prospects, politicians then, and after, have not embraced the principle with any enthusiasm. It might be argued that expectations about the benefits had never been high amongst the Black Americans themselves, so the limited effects of the application of affirmative action did not disappoint in so far as the initial promise was limited.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.